

DRAFT MINUTES

**INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE
VIRGINIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT BOARD**

**July 7, 2004
Richmond, Virginia**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Len Pomata, Acting Chairman
Chris Caine
Jimmy Hazel

MEMBERS ABSENT: James F. McGuirk, II
John C. Lee, IV

OTHERS PRESENT: Lem Stewart, Commonwealth Chief Information Officer
Jerry Simonoff, VITA Strategic Management Services Director
Dan Ziomek, VITA Associate Director for Project Management
Mike Sandridge, VITA Project Management Division
(See Attached Attendance Log)

Call to Order

Mr. Pomata called the Information Technology Project Review Committee meeting to order at 9:33 a.m. Following a roll call, Mr. Pomata acknowledged that a quorum of the members was present.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Pomata called for approval of the minutes of the May 5, 2004 Committee meeting.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Hazel that the minutes of the May 5, 2004, meeting of the IT Project Review Committee be approved as written. Seconded by Mr. Caine, the motion carried unanimously.

Committee Administration and Staff Support

Mr. Dan Ziomek, Associate Director of the VITA Project Management Division (PMD), reported that all previous Committee directed staff actions were completed or underway. Mr. Ziomek advised that staff was working on a number of revisions to the project charter and proposal templates which will be included in the Project Management Guideline to be published later this year. Mr. Ziomek explained the delay in giving Committee members access to the Dashboard system.

DRAFT MINUTES
IT Project Review Committee
Information Technology Investment Board
July 7, 2004

He then asked if members wanted to discuss a name change for the Committee, as discussed at the Board's June retreat meeting. Mr. Pomata acknowledged that as part of a general discussion by the Board of the Committee's broader scope, a name change seemed to be in order and may be discussed at a future meeting.

CIO Recommendation on Major IT Project Development and Procurement Approval; Major IT Project Status Reports; Independent Verification and Validation Program

Mr. Ziomek reported that at their June planning meeting the Board had directed the CIO to recommend a revised process for major IT project development and procurement approval in support of a bi-monthly meeting schedule.

Mr. Ziomek advised that four options were identified by PMD, in coordination with the Office of the Attorney General, for revising the current approval process. The CIO recommends Option 4 in which the Board would assign authority for major IT project development and procurement approval and disapproval to the CIO. The CIO would announce to the full Board the intent to take action, approve, or disapprove a major IT project or procurement, at least 5 working days before taking such action. The CIO would not take action if any Board member, within the 5 working day notice period, notified the CIO that the subject project or procurement must be reviewed by the Board's IT Project Review Committee followed by submission to the Board for approval. He further advised that a resolution would be presented to the Board to adopt that recommendation. In response to a question from Mr. Caine, members discussed a comparison of Option 3 and Option 4, as presented in the CIO Recommendation.

Mr. Ziomek noted that the resolution also directs the CIO to report at each regularly scheduled Board meeting on major IT projects development and procurement actions, CIO approvals and disapprovals, taken since the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Board. He then reviewed a draft *Major IT Project Status Report* that would be provided to the Board as a summary document on a bi-monthly basis. Discussion followed and Committee members suggested changes to the proposed format of the report. Mr. Pomata asked that both the appropriate start and end dates be reflected in each of the status report blocks.

Mr. Ziomek reported that the Commonwealth Technology Management Policy requires Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) for all major IT projects. He advised that the Project Management Division is developing IV&V standards, statements of work and a process to facilitate support of IV&V requirements through service providers. Mr. Ziomek reviewed the objectives of IV&V and presented draft standards that would be incorporated into the proposed Project Management Standard, scheduled for publication in September 2004.

Mr. Stewart noted that the IV&V was a *Code* requirement and that the program had been well received by legislators and the APA in recent presentations made to General Assembly committees.

DRAFT MINUTES
IT Project Review Committee
Information Technology Investment Board
July 7, 2004

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Hazel that the Committee recommend to the Board adoption of the resolution on Major IT Project Development and Procurement Approval, as recommended by the CIO. Seconded by Mr. Caine, the motion carried unanimously.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Hazel that the Committee endorse the draft IV&V standards. Mr. Caine seconded the motion. Discussion followed. Mr. Ziomek explained that the standards would probably undergo additional revisions before being included in the Project Management Standard. Mr. Hazel withdrew the motion.

Department of Corrections – Automated Offender Sentence Calculation System

Mr. Sandridge introduced John Taylor, Acting CIO, and Jody Rogish, project manager, from the Department of Corrections (DOC). He then gave a brief overview on DOC's request for development approval for the Automated Offender Sentence Calculation System.

Mr. Sandridge explained that the DOC currently supervises nearly 74,000 offenders—conducting approximately 12,000 initial sentence calculations each year and nearly 39,000 recalculations as the offenders' status changes over time. Also, DOC provides fundamental sentence and offense information to system users for a large portion of the nearly 45,000 probationers and other offenders on community supervision. This new system would replace the old Time Information Processing System (TIPS) component of the Offender Based State Correctional Information System (OBSCIS) with an application that will be able to integrate into a new automated Offender Management System while continuing to interface with OBSCIS and the Virginia Community Corrections Information System. The total estimated project cost is \$1,054,118. He advised that the anticipated cost savings for the project was \$2,176,830.

Mr. Sandridge advised that the Public Safety Oversight Committee had recommended development approval, subject to a contingency that they review the proposed contract prior to CIO approval. Discussion followed. Mr. Caine suggested that in the future it would be desirable to have the projected cost savings broken down into direct cost savings and cost savings contingent upon other actions. During the discussion it was noted that there were some related integrated projects. Mr. Pomata stated that he would like the Committee to have a presentation on the full set of integrated projects within the public safety agencies.

STAFF ACTION: Modify future CIO Recommendations on Major IT Projects to include both direct cost savings and cost savings contingent upon other actions.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Caine that the Committee recommend development approval to the IT Investment Board for the Department of Corrections' Automated Offender Sentence Calculation System with the contingency that the Public Safety Oversight Committee review the proposed contract prior to CIO approval. Seconded by Mr. Hazel, the motion carried unanimously.

DRAFT MINUTES
IT Project Review Committee
Information Technology Investment Board
July 7, 2004

Virginia Government Internet Domain Naming Standard

Mr. Paul Lubic, Associate Director of the Policy, Planning and Architecture Division, briefed Committee members on the draft *Virginia Government Internet Domain Standard*. He presented reasons for the re-branding of the Virginia portal to “Virginia.gov”-- noting that it would aid in developing statewide electronic directories and in reducing overhead and administrative costs. Also, the statewide standardization of web sites and email will enable VITA’s consolidation efforts in the future. He advised that the standard would formalize an existing requirement across Executive branch agencies. Mr. Lubic requested that the Committee endorse the standard and make a recommendation to the Board for approval.

Mr. Stewart discussed the benefits that would extend to local governments in being able to better communicate and participate in more enterprise activities.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Hazel that the Committee recommend to the Board the approval of the Virginia Government Internet Domain Standard. Seconded by Mr. Caine, the motion carried unanimously.

CIO Recommendation on Approval Process of ITRM Policies, Standards and Guidelines (PSG)

Mr. Lubic reported that the Board, at its June planning meeting, had requested a recommendation on the approval process for Information Technology Resource Management (ITRM) policies, standards, and guidelines. Mr. Lubic advised that the Policy, Practice and Architecture Division (PP&A) within VITA’s Strategic Management Services Directorate is revising the current *ITRM Standard on Policies, Standards and Guidelines: Procedures for Development, Adoption and Distribution*.

Mr. Lubic explained that ITRM policies and standards are mandatory on the Executive branch agencies; however, guidelines are considered best practices and compliance is optional. Policies are direction-setting documents, and standards and guidelines work within those policies and are more detailed and operational in nature. Mr. Lubic explained that three options had been considered and that the CIO was recommending Option 3.

Mr. Lubic presented a resolution for the Board’s consideration that would have the Board reserve to itself the approval of all ITRM policies, as well as those standards that directly affect the Board’s operation, and pursuant to appropriate guidelines assigns its authority to the CIO to approve all other standards and guidelines. The CIO would announce to the Board his intent to grant approval at least five working days before so doing. The CIO would not proceed to approve any proposed PSG publication if any Board member notifies the CIO within the five working day notice period that the subject PSG document must be reviewed by the Board. In such instances, the CIO would submit the PSG publication to the IT Project Review Committee who would in turn submit it to the Board at its next regular meeting with their recommendation to approve or disapprove.

DRAFT MINUTES
IT Project Review Committee
Information Technology Investment Board
July 7, 2004

Mr. Lubic asked that the Committee recommend to the Board adoption of the resolution assigning authority for the approval and disapproval of information technology resource management standards and guidelines to the Commonwealth Chief Information Officer, in accordance with the proposed guidelines.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Hazel that the Committee recommend to the Board adoption of the resolution recommended by the CIO assigning the Board's authority for the approval and disapproval of information technology resource management standard and guidelines to the Commonwealth Chief Information Officer, in accordance with the guidelines presented in the resolution. Seconded by Mr. Caine, the motion carried unanimously.

Commonwealth Portfolio and the Recommended Technology Investment Projects (RTIP)

Ms. Constance Scott, PMD staff, briefed Committee members on the IT Investment Board's annual report to the Governor and General Assembly on *Recommended Technology Investment Projects* (RTIP). She explained that the report recommends technology investments and priorities for funding such investments. The report is required to be submitted on September 1, 2004.

Ms. Scott reviewed the development process and format used for the 2003 RTIP report, and advised that the same process was being used for development of the 2004 RTIP report. She reviewed the current priority ranking process. She advised that the report would have an executive summary, a list of top priority technology investment projects, a listing of major projects by rank within Secretariats, the selection and ranking criteria, as well as project descriptions.

Ms. Scott also presented options for future consideration for defining top priority projects. Discussion followed, and Committee members agreed not to make changes to the structure for the 2004 report. However, Mr. Pomata asked that the Committee discuss the structure for the 2005 report at a meeting early next year.

Discussion followed on the tight timeline for review of the report by the Board before its submission on September 1. Mr. Hazel noted the importance of the report to the Governor and General Assembly and suggested that it be discussed by the full Board at their meeting later that day.

Mr. Stewart advised that he planned to make a request that the Board change their meeting schedule to even months, which would require an August meeting. Members also discussed the possibility of introducing a legislative amendment in 2005 to move the submission date of the report to October 1. Following the discussion, Committee members agreed that the draft RTIP report should be forwarded to the CIO and all Board members for review on July 29.

DRAFT MINUTES
IT Project Review Committee
Information Technology Investment Board
July 7, 2004

Other Business

Mr. Pomata requested, as an agenda item for future meetings, the Committee begin taking a long-term look at enterprise IT activities across each of the Secretariats.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:37 a.m.

DRAFT MINUTES
IT Project Review Committee
Information Technology Investment Board
July 7, 2004

ATTENDANCE LOG

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Tracy Surratt	Auditor of Public Accounts
W. R. Gay	Auditor of Public Accounts
C. W. Laugerbaum	Indigetechn
JoJo Martin	Virginia Community College System
Gary Bass	Department of Corrections
John Taylor	Department of Corrections
Bruce Blizzard	Department of Corrections
Debbie Adams	Department of Motor Vehicles
Anne Kerr	TS
Fred Norman	CVC, LLC
Dan Galloway	James Madison University
Ben Lewis	CGI – AMS
Jody Rogish	CGI – AMS
Sheryl Chasse	VITEK Systems
Courtney Kluender	student
Karen Helderman	APA
Chris Chappell	APA
Tracy Baynard	McGuire Woods Consulting
Fred Helm	Kemper Consulting
Chris Lan	BE
Carroll Mitchell	MCI
Judy Marchand	VITA
Patty Samuels	VITA
Michael Sandridge	VITA
Paul Lubic	VITA
Eric Perkins	VITA
Sally Love	VITA
Linda Hening	VITA
Barry Condrey	VITA
Janice Akers	VITA
Wayne Robertson	VITA
Roz Witherspoon	VITA/IT Investment Board